Response to Office Action mailed 02/04/2005
U.S. Pat App. No. 09/934,977
August 4, 2005
Page 6

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

A replacement sheet for Figs. 1A and 1B is enclosed. Figs. 1A and 1B have been amended to include the label "Prior Art".

The Examiner requested that Fig. 3 should also be amended to include the label "Prior Art." Applicant respectfully traverses since Fig. 3 is not indicated in the specification to be prior art.

Response to Office Action mailed 02/04/2005
U.S. Pat App. No. 09/934,977
August 4, 2005
Page 7

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Following the entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1, 4, 5-7 have been amended.

Claims 8-20 have been added.

Claims 1, 4, and 5-7 have been amended to clarify potential issues under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in particular with reference to antecedent basis, typographical errors, and capitalization errors for recited elements. Claim 1 also has been amended with the phrase "at least" (as in "dividing said FC frame Frame into at least a first FC fragment and a second FC fragment" to clarify that more than two FC fragments (such as 3 or 4 or more) may be employed to transport the original FC frame over a plurality of Ethernet frames (such as 2, 3, 4, or more Ethernet frames). Claim 6 has also been amended to clarify that a plurality of Ethernet frames, which may be two or more Ethernet frames, may be employed.

No new matter has been added and the amendments to these claims are intended to capture the full scope of Applicant's invention and are not intended to narrow their scope as a response to the cited prior art way.

Claim 7 has been amended to claim dependency from claim 6. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment obviates the claim objection (regarding claim sequencing) pursuant to MPEP 608.01(n).

Claims 8-20 have been added to claim subject matter disclosed in the specification as filed. No new matter is added by the addition of these claims.

35 USC 112 issue:

Claim 1, 4, and 6 have been amended to point out that the FC fragments (instead of the original FC frame) are sent in the Ethernet frames. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments obviate the rejections of these claims under 35 USC 112.

Claim 5 refers to the situation wherein the FC frame length is smaller than the maximum payload of the Ethernet frame. Accordingly, it is not necessary to divide the FC frame and the

Response to Office Action mailed 02/04/2005
U.S. Pat App. No. 09/934,977
August 4, 2005
Page 8

entire FC frame can be transmitted in a single Ethernet frame. The Examiner's rejection of claim

5 is respectfully traversed.

<u>35 USC 103 issue:</u>

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 as being unpatentable over Mulligan U.S. Patent

No. 6,12,190 ("Mulligan") and in view of AAPA. Applicant respectfully traverses.

It is respectfully submitted that, at minimum, neither Mulligan nor AAPA, alone or in

combination, disclose or suggest, in the manner claimed in the independent claims, the feature of

generating a storage transport layer field that stores the frame length of the Fibre Channel frame

and including that transport layer field in the Ethernet frames for transmission.

The sections in Mulligan which are cited by the Office Action as purported to show the

above-discussed feature (i.e., col. 9, lines 49-67 and col. 10, lines 1-14 of Mulligan) do not, upon

closer reading, appear to disclose or suggest this feature. For example, Mulligan does not

disclose the formation of a storage transport layer field to be sent along with the set of Ethernet

frames, which transport layer field contains the frame length of the Fibre Channel frame.

Although Mulligan discusses using the number of bytes in the original datagram to

determine how many smaller diagram needs to be sent (see col. 9, lines 49-51 of Mulligan),

Mulligan does not disclose or suggest the feature, in the manner claimed in the pending claims,

that a storage transport layer be formed for storing the frame size of the Fibre Channel frame,

which storage transport layer is then transmitted in the set of Ethernet frames to the intended

destination.

The significance of including the FC frame length in the transport layer field is discussed

in the specification at, for example, page 6 lines 12-19 and the discussion associated with Fig. 3.

Since the storage transport layer, being part of the transport layer, is part of the layer employed

by TCP to map the FC frame onto multiple Ethernet frames at the transmit side and reassemble

the Ethernet at the receiving side, the inclusion of this information in the storage transport layer

field advantageously permits TCP to perform its mapping and reassembling tasks. This feature

is lacking in the cited prior art, alone or in combination.

Furthermore, the values sent along in Mulligan's smaller datagrams are "the same header

information contained in the original datagram with addresses, offsets, checksums, and other

specific values adjusted to the specific fragment." See col. 10, lines 5-7 of Mulligan. This is

Response to Office Action mailed 02/04/2005
U.S. Pat App. No. 09/934,977
August 4, 2005
Page 9

different from Applicant's claimed invention in which the storage transport layer, not the header
of the Ethernet frame(s), contains the frame size of the Fibre Channel frame.

Further, the frame size of the Fibre Channel frame is also different from the data carried
in the headers of Mulligan's smaller datagrams since the frame size value of the Fibre Channel
frame is a calculated value (as opposed to being the same header information as suggested by
Mulligan), which frame size value does not get adjusted to the specific Ethernet frame that is
used to transmit the storage transport layer (which contains the frame size value).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are novel,
nonobvious, and patentable over the cited art of record, alone or in combination. Accordingly, a
Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees (beyond that authorized in
the enclosed credit card authorization) to process this Amendment, or credit any over-payments
that may apply, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2284 (Order No.ATEC-P004).

<div style="text-align:right;">

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph A. Nguyen/
Joseph A. Nguyen
Registration No. 37,899

</div>

Tel: 408-257-5500

Response to Office Action mailed 02/04/2005
U.S. Pat App. No. 09/934,977
August 4, 2005
Page 10

Appendix

Enclosed is a replacement sheet for Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B..